REMARKS

Summary

Claims 30-67 were pending. Claims 30, 33, 35, 36, 46-48, 51, and 53-57 have been amended and Claims 43-45, 60, and 63-67 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Claims 30-42, 46-59, and 61-62 are pending.

Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action indicated that the drawings must show a portable information module, a revision system, and a portable probe. Applicant has added attached Figs. 1-3, which illustrate a portable information module, a revision system, and a portable probe. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these figures.

Double Patenting

Claims 30-50 and 56-59 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-18 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/969,863. Claim 60 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obvious-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 26-30 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/969,863. This is a provisional double patenting rejection as neither the instant application nor co-pending Application No. 10/969,863 has issued as a patent. Accordingly, Applicant will address this issue if the provisional rejection ripens into a non-provisional rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 30-59 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action indicated the terms "providing instructions" in Claims 30-50 and 56-59 and "automatically determining" in Claims 51-55 render the claims indefinite as it is unclear what is providing the instructions, what instructions are being provided, who/what is receiving the instructions, and what is performing the determination step. The

Applicant has amended Claims 30, 51, and 56 to better clarify the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §101

Claims 30-59 were rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claims are not limited to useful, concrete, and tangible embodiments since "providing instructions" for making a configuration change and "automatically determining" are not concrete and tangible. The Applicant has amended Claims 30, 51, and 56, the Applicant submits that Claims 30-59 now overcome the rejection.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 30-34, 37-42, 49-50, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bartolutti (U.S. Patent 6,522,737) in view of Laor (U.S. Patent 6,002,331); Claims 35-36, 43-48, and 57-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Bartolutti in view of Laor and further in view of German (U.S. Patent 6,285,293); Claims 51-55 and 60-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Czosnowski (U.S. Patent 5,764,043) in view of what was well known in the art; and Claims 63-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Czosnowski in view of Laor. Applicant has amended Claims 30, 51, and 56 and submits that Claims 30-59 overcome the rejection.

Claim 30 recites a method of inserting a patch cord into first and second data ports in a local area network (LAN) comprising a computer system that controls the LAN, data ports, local system ports in communication with the computer system, and a visual indicator adjacent to each data port. The computer system determines whether instructions to insert the patch cord into the first data port have been correctly completed by analyzing a temporary connection formed by insertion of one end of the patch cord into one of the data ports and insertion of another end of the patch cord into one of the system ports. Of the visual indicators adjacent to the data ports, a state of only the visual indicator adjacent to the first data port is altered after the computer system determines that the instructions have been correctly completed to indicate that the instructions have been correctly completed. The state is altered before subsequent instructions to insert the

other end of the patch cord into the second data port have been completed. The patch cord is removed from the one of the system ports, thereby terminating the temporary connection, before the subsequent instructions have been completed.

None of the cited references anticipate or suggest such a method. As recited in Claim 30, the temporary connection is terminated prior to the subsequent instructions being completed. Thus, the patch cord is inserted into a data port and a system port; if the data port is the desired data port, the end of the patch cord in the system port is then removed from the system port and inserted into another desired data port to complete a connection between the desired data ports. Note that, as defined in the specification, the data ports and the system ports are different ports that have different functionalities. Neither Bartolutti nor Laor anticipates or suggests forming a temporary connection between one of the data ports and one of the system ports, which is terminated before the patch cord is inserted into the second of the two desired data ports. Nor do Bartolutti or Laor anticipate or suggest that the computer system determines whether the instructions have been correctly completed by analysis of the temporary connection.

For at least these reasons, neither Bartolutti nor Laor anticipates or suggests the method of Claim 30. Accordingly, Claim 30 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 56 recites a method of inserting a patch cord into first and second data ports in a system comprising a visual indicator and a local area network (LAN) containing a computer system that controls the LAN, data ports, and local system ports in communication with the computer system. The visual indicator is separable from the data ports. The method comprises the computer system determining whether instructions to insert the patch cord into the first data port have been correctly completed by analyzing a temporary connection formed by insertion of one end of the patch cord into one of the data ports and insertion of another end of the patch cord into one of the system ports. The state of the separable visual indicator is altered in response to the computer determining that the instructions have been correctly completed to indicate that the instructions have been correctly completed. The state is altered before subsequent instructions to insert the other end of the patch cord into the second data port have been completed. The patch cord is removed from the one of the system ports, thereby terminating the temporary connection,

before the subsequent instructions have been completed. The subsequent instructions are withheld until the instructions have been correctly completed.

In addition to the reasons provided above for Claim 30, neither Bartolutti nor Laor anticipates or suggests a method in which subsequent instructions to insert the end of the patch cord (which has been inserted in a system port) into a data port are withheld until instructions to insert a different end of the patch cord into a different data port have been correctly completed. Bartolutti teaches, in col. 4, lines 12-14 and col. 6, lines 34-46, that instructions are supplied directly to the telecommunication closet for the technician to read on-site. However, nowhere does Bartolutti specifically indicate that different sets of instructions for insertion of the patch cord are presented at different times and, more specifically, that the instructions to insert the second end of the patch cord are presented only after the first end of the patch cord has been correctly inserted. Similarly, Laor merely teaches a method in which LEDs at a particular data port are illuminated to indicate whether or not a desired connection has been correctly completed, but teaches nothing about withholding the subsequent instructions dependent on the initial instructions being correctly carried out.

For at least these reasons, neither Bartolutti nor Laor anticipates or suggests the method of Claim 56. Accordingly, Claim 56 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 51 recites a method of transferring a patch cord in a LAN from first and second data ports to second and third data ports. A computer system of the LAN automatically determines whether the patch cord is an appropriate length for establishing a connection between the second and third data ports before the patch cord is removed from the first data port and/or a manually-activated input is provided to indicate to the computer system that the patch cord is not the appropriate length. The computer system provides different instructions for a revisor depending on whether the patch cord is or is not the appropriate length after the computer system has automatically determined whether the patch cord is the appropriate length or the manually-activated input has been actuated to communicate to the computer system whether the patch cord is the appropriate length.

The Office Action takes official notice that a technician arriving at a location would "automatically" determine whether the cable was long enough for repositioning by visual examination. However, contrary to the official notice, a technician looking at the cable and making such a determination is a manual, not automatic, act. Not only is the difference between a manual and automatic act well known, but, in addition, Claim 51 makes a distinction between automatic and manual acts.

In addition to this distinction, however, Claim 51 further recites that the computer system automatically determines whether the patch cord is the appropriate length. Claim 51 also recites that the computer system provides different instructions depending on whether the patch cord is or is not the appropriate length after the computer system has automatically determined whether the patch cord is the appropriate length or the manually-activated input has been actuated to communicate to the computer system whether the patch cord is the appropriate length.

None of the cited references anticipate or suggest such a method. In addition, the Office Action indicates that Czosnowski discloses the manually-activated input recited in Claim 51. However, Czosnowski is merely directed towards an arrangement for tracing a cable connection. To this end, Czosnowski teaches that a power supply unit 126 has a switch 154 that supplies a voltage thereby lighting LEDs 78 at ports into which the patch cord is plugged to trace the patch cord. Thus, the switch of Czosnowski has nothing to do with indicating to the computer system whether the patch cord is not the appropriate length, as recited in Claim 51.

None of the cited references anticipate or suggest the method of Claim 51. Accordingly, Claim 51 is patentable over the cited references.

In addition, if the next Office Action continues to take official notice of any of the steps of the method of Claim 51, Applicant respectfully requests that adequate evidence of such be provided in the next Office Action per MPEP 2144.03.

For similar reasons, Claim 61 is patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 31-42, 46-50, 52-55, 57-59, and 62 are patentable without more. However, Claims 31-42, 46-50, 52-55, 57-59, and 62 are also independently patentable. For

example, nowhere do any of the cited references anticipate or suggest specifically withholding the subsequent instructions to insert the other end of the patch cord into a second data port until the instructions to insert the patch cord into the first data port have been correctly completed, as recited in Claim 31. Nor do any of the cited references anticipate or suggest specifically altering the state *only* after the instructions have been correctly completed, as recited in Claim 32. Although the Office Action states that Laor discloses such a method, Laor actually teaches that different colors are illuminated dependent on whether the instructions have been correctly completed. In fact, the Office Action relies on the same passage of Laor in rejecting Claim 37, which recites that the state is altered differently depending on whether the instructions have been correctly or incorrectly completed. This is incongruous – the same passage cannot both indicate that the LED is altered only after the instructions have been correctly completed (Claim 32) and that the LED is altered differently depending on whether the instructions have been correctly or incorrectly completed (Claim 37). Thus, none of the cited references anticipate or suggest the arrangement of Claims 31 or 32.

Nor do Bartolutti or Laor disclose the further elements of Claims 33 or 34. Moreover, neither Bartolutti nor Laor teaches altering the state of a visual indicator on the patch cord in same manner and/or at the same time as a visual indicator not on the patch cord as recited in Claim 38.

Claim 40 recites that scanning and/or analyzing of the data ports is limited to only the data ports having activated visual indicators. Neither the passage of Bartolutti nor the passage of Laor cited in the Office Action makes any statement about such a limitation. To the contrary, the Office Action refers to a passage of Bartolutti that explicitly states that all of ports are monitored. Similarly, the Office Action refers to a passage of Laor that merely states that the system operator can make a connection status query but indicates nothing about limiting scanning or analysis of the ports. Thus, none of the cited references anticipate or suggest the arrangement of Claim 40. Nor do any of the cited references explicitly describe the further elements of Claims 41 and 42.

Claim 46 recites providing directions to a general location of the first data port and altering the state of the visual indicator adjacent to the first data port only after an end of the patch cord is inserted into a local system port at the general location. The Office Action indicates that

German discloses these limitations. However, German teaches only that the exact patch cord/port information is displayed on the rack controller display. German teaches neither that directions are provided *to the general location* of the first data port nor that the visual indicator state is altered only after an end of the patch cord is inserted into a local system port at the general location. Nor does any reference explicitly describe the further elements of Claims 47 and 48.

Note that the above dependent claims and additional reasons are provided as examples only. In the Office Action, most of the rejections of dependent claims cite one or more references in their entirety without specifying where the claimed limitations are found. Nor has Applicant been able to find the claimed limitations in the references. Thus, if the rejections are maintained in the next Office Action, the Applicant respectfully requests that the next Office Action indicate precisely where in the reference each element may be found, as required by 37 CFR 1.104.

Accordingly, dependent Claims 31-42, 46-50, 52-55, 57-59, and 62 are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

The Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be desirable to clear up further issues, he is encouraged to contact the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number below. The Applicant herein petitions for a two-month extension to file this response. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees deemed necessary with the submission of this response, except the issue fee, to Deposit Account Number 16-0228.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 19, 2007

Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,193
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 32,915
Panduit Corp.
Legal Department - TP12
17301 S. Ridgeland Avenue
Tinley Park, Illinois 60477-3091
(708) 532-1800, Ext. 1369